

REMARKS

Claims 11-18 remain in the application for consideration of the Examiner.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections are respectfully requested in light of the above amendments and following remarks.

Claims 11-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement.

This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner rejects Claims 11-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph for the reason that the claims are not supported by the originally filed disclosure.

The function of the description requirement of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112, is to insure that the inventor had possession as of the filing date of the application relied on, of the specific subject matter later claimed by him.

It is not necessary that the application described the claim limitations exactly but only so clearly that persons of ordinary skill in the art would recognize from the disclosure that the Applicants invention possessed, the claimed subject matter including those limitations.

It is respectfully submitted that utilizing and controlling when referring to a processor is sufficiently clear that one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized what the inventor had invented.

It is respectfully submitted that Claims 11-18 are in full compliance with 35 U.S.C. § 112 and complies with the written description requirement.

Turning now to the art rejections, Claims 11-13 and 16-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Suzuki in view of Moon; and Claims 14 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Suzuki and Moon in view of Official Notice.

These rejections are respectfully traversed.

It is respectfully submitted that Suzuki does not disclose or suggest the presently claimed invention including an expected response and controlling a model reference control technique after initialization of the hard disk drive based on expected response to the actuator to a feed forward control signal.

Applicants agree with the Examiner that this aspect is not taught by Suzuki.

It is respectfully submitted that Moon does not disclose or suggest the presently claimed invention including a digital signal processor controlling a model reference control technique after initialization of the hard disk drive system and based on the expected response to the actuator to a feed forward control signal.

The Examiner's attention is directed to column 14, lines 50-55 of Moon.

Here, Moon discloses the necessary value of C_{ffwd} may be determined by manual characterization of the disk drive or by automated self-characterization during the disk drive initialization.

In contrast, the present invention performs these functions after the initialization.

The Official Notice does not cure these defects.

It is respectfully submitted that Claims 11-18 define over the applied art.

In light of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance, and notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

While it is believed that the instant response places the application in condition for allowance, should the Examiner have any further comments or suggestions, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact the undersigned in order to expeditiously resolve any outstanding issues.

To the extent necessary, Applicant petitions for an Extension of Time under 37 CFR 1.136. Please charge any fees in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to the deposit account of Texas Instruments Incorporated, Account No. 20-0668.

Respectfully submitted,



W. Daniel Swayze, Jr.
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 34,478

Texas Instruments Incorporated
P.O. Box 655474, MS 3999
Dallas, TX 75265
(972) 917-5633